



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,366	12/18/2001	Muljadi Sulistio	CMRC 1008-1	8061
22470	7590	05/05/2005	EXAMINER	
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP P O BOX 366 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/026,366

Applicant(s)

SULISTIO ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 7 March 2005.
2. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1 and 12 are independent claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogbuji (Validating XML with Schematron, 2000).

As per independent claim 1, Ogbuji discloses the method for error processing and reporting during validation of a business document in a client-server environment, the method including:

- Accessing a first self-describing, structured document having a document type (page 2, paragraph 2: Here, XML is a structured self-describing document)
- Validating the first document against a schema corresponding to the document type (page 2, paragraph 2)
- Generating a second self-describing, structured document including, for any detected errors:

Art Unit: 2178

- At least one identifier (page 4, code sample 2: Here, a tag represents an identifier; page 4, paragraph 2; page 6, paragraph 3)
  - A path specification identifying a node within the primary document corresponding to the detected error (page 4, code sample 2; page 4, paragraph 2; page 6, paragraph 3)
- Applying a declarative transformation to the first and second documents, producing a user interface character string including a plurality of:
  - Path specifications for nodes in the first document (page 4, code sample 2; page 4, paragraph 2; page 6, paragraph 3)
  - Values for nodes in the first document (page 4, code sample 2; page 4, paragraph 2; page 6, paragraph 3)
- At least one error message corresponding to the at least one error identifier (page 6, paragraph 3)
- Transmitting the user interface character string (page 7, paragraph 4- page 8, paragraph 5)

As per dependent claim 2, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the schema is compliant with any version of a SOX standard (page 2, paragraph 5).

As per dependent claim 3, Ogbuji discloses the method further including validating the first document against a set of business processing rules and generating a third self-describing, structured document, wherein the declarative transformation is further applied to the third document (page 8, paragraph 1).

As per dependent claim 4, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the declarative transformation is compliant with an XSLT standard (page 3, paragraph 5).

As per dependent claim 5, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the declarative transformation is compliant with an XSLT standard (page 3, paragraph 5).

As per dependent claim 6, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an HTML standard (page 8, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 7, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an HTML standard (page 8, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 8, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an HTML standard (page 8, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 9, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an XML standard (page 8, paragraph 3).

As per dependent claim 10, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an XML standard (page 8, paragraph 3).

As per dependent claim 11, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an XML standard (page 8, paragraph 3).

As per independent claim 12, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those disclosed in claim 1, and are thusly rejected under Ogbuji. Ogbuji further discloses validating the first document against a set of business processing rules applicable to the document type and an intended recipient of the first document (page 3, paragraph 4- page 8, paragraph 6).

As per dependent claim 13, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the business processing rules are Schematron-complaint (page 3, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 14, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the declarative transformation is compliant with an XSLT standard (page 3, paragraph 5).

As per dependent claim 15, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the declarative transformation is compliant with an XSLT standard (page 3, paragraph 5).

As per dependent claim 16, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an HTML standard (page 8, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 17, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an HTML standard (page 8, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 18, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an HTML standard (page 8, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 19, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an XML standard (page 8, paragraph 3).

As per dependent claim 20, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an XML standard (page 8, paragraph 3).

As per dependent claim 21, Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the interface character string is compliant with an XML standard (page 8, paragraph 3).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per independent claims 1 and 12, the applicant argues that Ogbuji fails to disclose the limitations:

- Generating a second self-describing, structured document including, for any detected errors:
  - At least one identifier (page 4, code sample 2: Here, a tag represents an identifier; page 4, paragraph 2; page 6, paragraph 3)
  - A path specification identifying a node within the primary document corresponding to the detected error (page 4, code sample 2; page 4, paragraph 2; page 6, paragraph 3)
- Applying a declarative transformation to the first and second documents, producing a user interface character string including a plurality of:
  - Path specifications for nodes in the first document (page 4, code sample 2; page 4, paragraph 2; page 6, paragraph 3)
  - Values for nodes in the first document (page 4, code sample 2; page 4, paragraph 2; page 6, paragraph 3)
- At least one error message corresponding to the at least one error identifier (page 6, paragraph 3)
- Transmitting the user interface character string (page 7, paragraph 4- page 8, paragraph 5)

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner has sited sections within the Ogbuji reference to address the claimed limitations. Further, the applicant claims disclose generating error messages for validation errors. Ogbuji discloses the

generation of an error message when a document is invalid according to a schema (page 4, paragraphs 1-2). In the example on page 4, the error message is "Invalid XML." This error message is similar to a message the Schematron is able to generate in a second structured document (page 4, paragraph 2). Further, Schematron is able to substitute element names and paths into a second structured document when validating elements of a first document (page 6, paragraphs 1-3). The path as element that is reported with a validation method is in the XPath format (page 6, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 2, the applicant fails to set forth any reasons other than those discussed with regards to claim 1.

As per dependent claim 3, the applicant argues that Ogbuji fails to disclose the limitations further including validating the first document against a set of business processing rules and generating a third self-describing, structured document, wherein the declarative transformation is further applied to the third document (page 8, paragraph 1). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ogbuji discloses the ability to generate any number of validating stylesheets with Ogbuji (page 7, final paragraph (continued on the top of page 8)). Further, schematron-report produces output in a two frame frameset (page 8, paragraph 3). The first contains the generated error messages; the second contains the invalid XML source elements.

As per dependent claims 4-11, and 13-21, the applicant fails to set forth any reasons other than those discussed above.

### ***Conclusion***



Art Unit: 2178

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

**kr**



**CESAR PAULA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**